



# County of San Diego

JEAN M. SHEPARD  
DIRECTOR

## HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES AGENCY

NANCY L. BOWEN, M.D., M.P.H.  
PUBLIC HEALTH OFFICER

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICES  
1700 PACIFIC HIGHWAY, SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92101-2417  
(619) 531-5800 FAX (619) 515-6707

Community Epidemiology  
Emergency & Disaster Medical Services  
HIV/AIDS Services  
Maternal, Child and Family Health Services  
Public Health Laboratory  
PH Nursing/Border Health  
TB & STD Control  
Vital Records

CSA-17 Advisory Committee  
Tom Slipper, Chair/Maggie Houlihan, Vice-Chair  
c/o Emergency Medical Services  
6255 Mission Gorge Road  
San Diego, CA 92120  
(619) 285-6429 Fax: (619) 285-6531

## CSA-17 SPECIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

**Tuesday, January 3, 2006**

### **Members Present**

Finnell, Mayor Jerry – City of Del Mar  
Hickerson, Tom – Rancho Santa Fe Fire Protection Dist.  
Houlihan, Maggie – City of Encinitas  
Marquardt, Larry – Member-at-Large  
Zovanyi, Peter – Member-at-Large

### **County Staff Present**

Lindstrom, Mark  
Marcotte, R.N., Annie  
Metz, R.N., Marcy

### **Recorder**

Rupp, Merle

### **Members Absent**

Powell, Mayor David – City of Solana Beach  
Slipper, Tom – Torrey Pines Comm. Planning Group

### **Guests Present**

Abelman, Dismas – Solana Beach/Del Mar Fire  
Cerny, Barbara – Encinitas Fire  
Johnson, Wayne – S.D. Medical Services Enterprise  
Michel, Tony – Rancho Santa Fe Fire Protection Dist.  
Muir, Mark – Encinitas Fire  
Ott, Chief David – Solana Beach/Del Mar Fire  
Pavone, Chief Nick – Rancho Santa Fe Fire Prot. Dist.  
Simonsen, Michael – S.D. Medical Services Enterprise

## **I. INTRODUCTIONS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Vice-Chair Maggie Houlihan, brought the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. Attendees introduced themselves.

## **II. STRATEGIC PLAN IMPLEMENTATION**

(Mark Lindstrom) The memo dated December 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2005, we presented our Strategic Plan at the previous meeting in December and, at that time, indicated we'd like to implement two additional twelve-hour ambulances and convert the system to a one-and-one system instead of a two-paramedic system. At this time we're unable to implement that Plan so discussion ensued among the Advisory Committee members and everyone present and the determination was made we should look at implementing part of the Plan so that what we're here for today, as the

memo stated, we'd like to get your support of implementing one twelve-hour ambulance to be headquartered at Rancho Station #2 and that would be a one paramedic, one EMT ambulance to operate twelve hours per day. That ambulance would be permanently in motion in anticipation of the next problem EMS call. I guess that is essentially all I have.

(Mark continued) We did some calculations and figured the cost of that ambulance would be about \$164,000 this fiscal year and \$417,000 in 2006-07. We included five-year progressions showing the system as it currently is vs. what we're projecting what would happen if we implemented the second car. Those are the spread sheets A and B, the new proposal. We're looking for a motion hopefully in support of our Plan and we'll go from there.

(Jerry Finnell) I did want to make a brief point of clarification. In the materials, it's indicated one of the hold-ups is the City of Del Mar will not be totally compliant for at least another two years. I just want for the record to indicate while it is our goal, Chief Ott has some staffing plans and things in mind that would help us achieve compliance within a two-year time frame, there's no assurance we'll be able to do that and we do not have funds in our budget to solve this problem any other way. While we're comfortable with the general plan and hopefully in compliance within two years, there's no guarantees we'll be there. We're working hard towards it.

(Mark Lindstrom) I neglected to say with implementing the one additional system, that will give us some stats on how is this unit helping and where is it being called to the most. We discussed at the Chief Ops meeting we'd headquarter the unit at Rancho Santa Fe #2 to start with and look at that for 90 days and is it working to the best effect of the CSA? We talked maps. The Plan would hopefully be implemented February 1<sup>st</sup>, would give us 90 days to look at things, then look at the numbers, come back to this group in the May meeting with a report and further recommendations if necessary.

(Maggie Houlihan) I think the consultant recommended out of the two, if we did one (#!?), if they recommend positioning Fire Station #4 at Encinitas, as I didn't remember us having a consensus to station it at Rancho Santa Fe. My concerns are, if I remember correctly, am I correct or maybe I don't remember correctly, did we have a recommendation we would station this? If there was only the one out of two stations, at Station 4 Encinitas as based on the consultant's recommendation.

(Mark Lindstrom) My recommendation of the discussion at the last meeting was we would headquarter at Station 2 where we are currently set up to do one-and-one with Rancho Santa Fe. I don't remember exactly what the consultant's report said.

(Annie Marcotte) If you had to go with just one unit, it should be on the coast. We were going to go with two units because one of the areas of the coast can't cover one-on-one. At the time we had our discussion at the Advisory meeting, I believe there was no consensus. Encinitas couldn't go one-and-one but apparently they can. The consultant also said the best location in Rancho Santa Fe would be Station 3 and 4 in Rancho Santa Fe but 3 is not equipped to have an ambulance so Station 2 became the default. I don't know, I did recall we discussed at the last meeting that we could start it on the east end because we had the capability of having the one-and-one already.

(Maggie Houlihan) It seems strange to me we're not going with the recommendation for Rancho Santa Fe and not with the recommendation if you only had one, you would station at Station 4, so we're not following either recommendation and I don't know if the committee is

comfortable with that.

(Larry Marquardt) I was working with setting this up and on the Strategic Plan, one of the things with the whole thing was these would not be stationed. They're going to float. If a call is made out of Encinitas and the ambulance has gone there, then that unit would float towards that area because it is vulnerable. As far as all the stuff from the consultant was this would not be a stationary unit. Has to have a place to start with and that's the only thing.

(Maggie Houlihan) I'm concerned we're not following the consultant's when we talked about twelve-hour ambulances about where to house it or where the base should be and we're not actually—we came up with our own recommendation, and to tell you the truth, I just want to make sure we have a solid rationale whether it's moving around or not. If we only had one they expected it to be moving. I am re-trying to re-visit it. I want to make sure there was a rationale and I think the consultant's report was reasonable. I don't remember all of our discussion at the November meeting. Seems like we came up with ideas but now we're moving away with either of the recommendations of the consultants. What's the solid justification and the name of the working group, that's the operational group? What's some of the feelings from that meeting?

(Mark Muir) My recollection of the consultant was Station 4 at Encinitas as the second unit; Rancho Santa Fe or Elfin Forest based on the discussion we had today. There was a system-status process. The unit roves and goes wherever it is needed and the providing agency provides a controller. We talked about you log into Station 2, then out to the coast, then you'd be going back. The conversation we had today we placed it back on the provider and let him control where that unit is. We talked about a 75 or 90 day review and changing the date so I think we could change the next Advisory Committee meeting date in May.

(Jerry Finnell) Could we try it in one location for 75 days and another location for 75 days and see if it makes a difference?

(Maggie Houlihan) If we have a consultant that made that recommendation, I don't know how it works or have any operational experience, I guess there's no real problem with it. Help me remember why we discussed moving it to Rancho Santa Fe station.

(Annie Marcotte) When we first brought up the discussion about where to locate the ambulances we were looking at, do you cover for calls or for geography? On the coast, uncredited. Currently, they get about 90 to 93% met within the time frame without any exceptions. On the eastern end we have a whole area of not having it covered on time of course. There are not as many calls. There's a lot of calls on the coast. We looked at trying to develop a system to cover not only the geographic response time but also the calls time. We found that the most flexibility in the system would be to have two twelve-hour calls, one stationed in the eastern end and the other stationed on the coast. We would like to do that. That would be the best we could do at this point and time. The economic feasibility of implementing both is not exactly there unless you want to discuss that. We thought we could do a partial implementation. Rancho Santa Fe is already a one-and-one station, that's not an issue, and, at the time we did not have any good feelings that Encinitas would go to one-and-one. That has changed, but at the time that's why we had discussed putting it out there. Actually if you want to think about it, it doesn't matter where it goes, it's going to always be moving. We are going to have the provider do all the managing of that unit because the dispatch can't manage the system status so, in affect, they'll put it wherever it needs to be to go to the next call. That's the recommendation that I recall from our consultant was if you had only one unit, it should go on the coast, but we were building the system with two units. So now we're implementing the one

unit but not necessarily stay that way, so we can develop stats with that unit to find out where in fact is it going to be responding to. We don't know if it will always be on the coast. That was the whole basis for putting that. I have no problem with changing that discussion.

(Peter Zovanyi) Do you think the success is going to hinge on what's going to happen with the compliance figures? What do you anticipate we could do 60 days here and 60 days here with respect to the compliance on the coast. If we didn't have it on the coast I don't think it would affect the compliance on the coast because it's already very high with respect to the eastern area. If it's available more to the east or the Rancho Santa Fe ambulance, that's already there and not pulled out of there to cover the coast, then you have better compliance on the eastern end. I don't think we'll have some areas hard to cover. This ameliorates some of these issues. Would it impact the coast? Sure. Would be a good way to find out.

(Maggie Houlihan) Other question. The consultants—if we're only implementing one—we're looking at this with just one—I want to get a clarification from Barbara or Mark on the Encinitas not being one-on-one.

(Barbara Cerny) We have been able to cover the one-and-one on every one of our engines. We have to have the engineer medics.

(Annie Marcotte) One paramedic and one EMT instead of two paramedics on the ambulance.

(Mark Muir) The consultant's analysis—the eastern area looked at the geographic area vs. the call area. Geographical location and incident numbers were taken into consideration.

(Maggie Houlihan) I'm looking at this as a district which we are. I don't understand why we would not start the evaluation based on the consultant's recommendation because the consultant's took all of this into consideration. Do the evaluation there and see what happens. Seems we are not really talking about implementing two. 2009-2010 budget we're looking at and we're still talking about one for the foreseeable future.

(Mark Lindstrom) We're not talking about implementing one, but for the overall Plan we're talking about implementing two. We can't implement two now so let us implement part of it. We are going to be looking at some scenarios that would allow us to implement the second half of the Plan so by next meeting in May we can have some information for us. If we implement the second half of the Plan under circumstances and see how things would look financially.

(Maggie Houlihan) In this evaluation we might find things are working really well, can we look at that? Are the two going to make that?

(Annie Marcotte) Two gives us flexibility in this system to cover both the geographic and call volume. We may be able to accomplish the same thing with just one additional unit. We have nothing to base this on except for computer modules and past history.

(Jerry Finnell) What difference does it make if it's always on the move?

(Mark Lindstrom) It's a great argument.

(Maggie Houlihan) Why would the consultant have gone to the trouble to say it does matter? Even when they were recommending one they were recommending this kind of flexibility.

(Annie Marcotte) Both of them were anticipated to be moving.

(Maggie Houlihan) That's my question as well. Why did the consultants do the evaluation then? With one he felt it would be appropriate at Encinitas Station 4. If I'm going to ignore their recommendation, I want to understand why.

(Mark Lindstrom) I would guess that's where the high volume is so start it at the high volume area. If you're only going to have one where it's more likely the first unit would get called out and be needed there.

(Peter Zovanyi) I have no problem with the trial period. Since it's going to be a mobile unit I'm not sure where we're going to be.

(Annie Marcotte) I think essentially we're asking you to implement partially the system, knowing full well in the next meeting you'll be getting additional information to look at complete implementation, implementing part of the system to develop actual stats to see where that ambulance will be responding.

(Peter Zovanyi) Will that be different in where the stats are now or just our ability to respond now more affectively?

(Annie Marcotte) We know we have peak hours in which to add a unit where they're unit will be used most. We can assume it will be the coast but we don't know that.

(Peter Zovanyi) The operators will learn the streets driving back and forth. I've always been troubled by our lack of compliance in the eastern area.

(Annie Marcotte) It's a glaring difference.

(Mark Muir) We're looking at an evaluation period. Maybe your suggestion about over at Station 2 or One is a healthy recommendation so we're going to analyze the information to make an informed recommendation.

(Maggie Houlihan) I'm also concerned depending on the time period where you're evaluating in the summer you're going to get a lot more calls in Encinitas.

(Annie Marcotte) The time period we're looking at is February through April.

(Wayne Johnson) The consultant did their analysis based on call responses in the district as a whole. A lot of the recommendations were based on that fundamental basis. That's why you see the Station 4 issue come up. One thing the evaluation doesn't take into consideration is what happens if the extra unit you put on, takes that call that normally the Rancho Santa Fe unit would have to take if that unit wasn't there and what effect that will have on Rancho Santa Fe. Nobody really knows. My recommendation would be to think more on the macro level and not so much where the unit might be. Make the charge to the provider to say instead. I can't change anything in this contract period. My recommendation is let the provider equalize call distribution and geographic coverage and it may happen by taking more calls on the coast. We may want to move 96 further east or do some things to try to cover those calls a little better. In the meantime, let us work that with the Chiefs and the folks here to operationally see if that may work out a little better and study that, rather than lock us into here 75 days here, or 75 days there. Higher compliance will result. The reason for the five units was to make the CSA self-

sustaining. We're going to be. With credited compliance we're going to be close to 100% compliant in this scenario. The coast, yea, is going to get better and other things are going to get better but cost benefit out of this. What happens when we're not the provider and we don't have Medic 33 and 24 into the system? The other component is make the system kind of self-sustaining from that stand point. You have an RFP coming up this year. This contract goes out to bid. Then decide, do we want 90% compliance in Rancho and Elfin Forest and see what the bids come in at.

(Peter Zovanyi) The critical part of this whole proposal is the creation of a new twelve-hour unit, so regardless of where it's ended up, aren't we going to expect a more home-based Rancho unit and better compliance?

(Wayne Johnson) That would be the anticipated benefit right now. If that occurs you have a move-up twelve-hour car in there. Maybe they pick it up and Rancho stays there. The question becomes how do we handle the Four-S Ranch and the eastern part of the district and move it out and have the twelve-hour come out of Station One to be closer to that.

(Nick Pavone) One of the problems we see experiencing is the longer response time on the eastern part of the district. There are units available on the coast and the A Unit from the coast goes east, then that creates a vacancy on the coast where the next call problem is. We don't have a problem getting the unit to the coast but getting the additional units, but that creates a longer response time in the eastern portion of the district so an additional unit will provide more flexibility on longer response times.

(Jerry Finnell) I would like to go down the path of experimenting. Try it in two different locations to see if it makes a difference.

(Maggie Houlihan) And see if the operational group, so we can authorize the additional twelve-hour units. Get it worked out to make everyone comfortable to get the best of everything all said and done.

(Peter Zovanyi) So the provider is seeing it through the operational chiefs. So the extra unit is critical.

(Maggie Houlihan) So we're discussing so the ops chiefs can report back; how does that sound to everybody?

(Mark Lindstrom) I interpreted what Wayne said, rather Jerry said, try it here and try it here for equal amounts of time.

(Wayne Johnson) We're the provider. We'll do whatever you want to do.

(Maggie Houlihan) You guys work together to come up with a model to location by location and we'd support the additional twelve-hour unit and you guys do the evaluation as you see how things work and report back to us, but you would be including the advantages and disadvantages of both locations.

(Larry Marquardt) That will be the case. If they start out in one spot, they'll find out which is the most logical and which unit is going to be used the most. Make sure it's being used to the best advantage.

(Mark Muir) An evaluation period of 90 or 75 days, we can still do that and update you and re-evaluate where to move it or keep it where it's at.

(Peter Zovanyi) The flexibility is critical. **MOTION: Peter Zovanyi/Seconded by Mayor Jerry Finnell) Our charge on the Board is to authorize the additional unit expenditure and whatever the planning recommendation in a general sense was, I wasn't on that committee. I'm certainly in support of authorizing that additional twelve-hour unit.**

(Peter continued) Twelve-hour car yes. You guys figure out how to distribute it and evaluate it and come back and tell us. Importantly, we're authorizing an additional twelve-hour unit consistent with the recommendations of the Strategic Committee to be utilized in the best use of the district and we're looking for a report back and put back the Advisory Committee meeting by a couple of weeks.

(Mark Lindstrom) We need a contract amendment with Wayne and get that amendment through the system and go from there.

(Maggie Houlihan) Even if we have our regularly scheduled meeting, we may find a progress report anyway and call a separate special meeting. **Jerry Finnell seconded it again here. Noone was opposed and no abstentions.**

(Maggie continued) Before we adjourn, can I ask two quick questions to remind us in the minutes we find out about the property tax negotiations that will be an agenda item and our Health and Wellness January 28<sup>th</sup> in Encinitas. We're having it in Encinitas.

(Michael Simonsen) As Lisa is normally here, she's leading this. It's a health fair at a Encinitas Community and Senior Center. We're going to be offering free CPR classes limited to people who sign up and health experts there. I believe it starts at 9:00 a.m. and goes to noon or 1:00 p.m.

(Maggie Houlihan) We want to make sure we get folks there and get a press release. He (Michael) will send an e-mail on that and before the press release goes out, I'd like to look at that.

(Mark Lindstrom) Once we approve the press release, Merle can send it out.

(Peter Zovanyi) A resource item, just a simply mapping of stations and units would be good for board members.

### **III. ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION made by Tom Hickerson, Seconded by Peter Zovanyi, to adjourn the meeting. MOTION carried.**

The meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Merle Rupp, County EMS